

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

CONTOUR IP HOLDING, LLC and)	
ION WORLDWIDE, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 15-1108-LPS-CJB
)	
GOPRO, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

At Wilmington this **6th day of June, 2016.**

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2016, the Court held a hearing in which it heard oral argument regarding two pending motions to stay filed by Defendant GoPro, Inc. (“GoPro”) and conducted a scheduling conference pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, (D.I. 41);

WHEREAS, during that hearing, Plaintiffs Contour IP Holding, LLC (“CIPH”) and iON Worldwide, Inc. (“iON”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) discussed certain confidential communications and negotiations between iON and third-party Contour, LLC and between iON and CIPH;

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2016, Plaintiffs moved to redact portions of the transcript from that hearing before it became publically available, (D.I. 50), in accordance with this Court’s Policy on the Electronic Availability of Transcripts of Court Proceedings (available at www.ded.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/forms/Transcripts-DE.pdf);

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs’ proposed redactions consist of the following:

Page 51, line 6 (after “merger”)

Page 51, line 7 (entire line)

Page 51, line 8 (before “and ultimately”)

Page 52, lines 2-7 (entire lines)

Page 52, line 8 (before “It’s”)

Page 57, line 14 (after “case”)

Page 57, lines 15-21 (entire lines)

WHEREAS, GoPro does not oppose Plaintiffs’ motion (D.I. 50 at 1);

WHEREAS, the proposed redactions are limited in scope, totaling approximately 18 lines of the 122-page transcript, (*id.*, exs. A-B);

WHEREAS, and considering the question as to this Motion only,¹ the Court finds that good cause exists to believe that disclosure of those portions of the transcript would work a “clearly defined and serious injury” to Plaintiffs, *Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 23 F.3d 772, 786 (3d Cir. 1994) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted), in that the redactions are said to relate to certain confidential and sensitive business information regarding Plaintiffs.

THEREFORE, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiffs’ unopposed motion is GRANTED.
2. The electronic transcript from the April 19, 2016 teleconference shall be sealed, and a redacted version of the transcript, containing the redactions delineated above, shall be

¹ To the extent that the Court later determines that the content of any of this redacted material is necessary and important to its decision on either of the pending motions to stay, (D.I. 10, 14), and to the extent that the Court thereafter includes reference to this redacted material in its opinion(s) resolving one or both of those motions, nothing in the instant Order precludes the Court from determining that such portions of its opinion(s) should be unredacted. Before making reference to any such material public, the Court would give the parties the further opportunity to address the issue.

filed on the docket of this case by the Clerk of the Court upon receipt from the court reporter.



Christopher J. Burke
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE